



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the light of Lindsay's discovery, published in *Philologus*, LI, pp. 364 ff.

Lindsay brings strong evidence to show that even after literature began, the early law of accentuation prevailed in the case of tetrasyllabic words with the quantitative combination $\cup\cup\cup\cup$, inasmuch as in the early drama the accent seems to have fallen on the first syllable of these words. The unaccented antepenult might therefore easily be suppressed, and *fácilia* would become *facilia* in ordinary pronunciation. Strong support for Lindsay's theory and for this explanation of the verse before us at the same time is found in the actual occurrence on the stone in C. I. L. I¹ 892 of *Licnia* for *Licinia*, while a comparison of the classical form *optuma* with the archaic *ôpitûma* of No. 14 points in the same direction.

On the other hand, it is possible to suppose that there is a resolution of the long syllable of the dactyl as in Enn. Ann. 267.

The collection is intended to be complete. It contains, in fact, inscriptions published as late as 1896 (cf., e. g., No. 1814). It is the more surprising, therefore, not to find certain undoubtedly metrical inscriptions which have appeared in the Corpus. Cases in point are VIII 369, XII 975 and 5276. Furthermore, V 1721 seems to have at least a metrical beginning, and V 1693, 4754, 6218 and X 4104 might properly find a place among the *commatica* or *polymetra*.

The second volume has indices giving first lines, proper names and corresponding passages from professional poets.

Some readers might find it convenient to have an index indicating the corresponding number in the Corpus. The editor has, however, forestalled this criticism by remarking that other indices had been prepared, but that it was found desirable to omit them on account of lack of space.

It is needless to say that the book throughout shows that acuteness, learning and sound judgment which characterize all of Bücheler's work.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

The Italic Dialects, edited, with a Grammar and Glossary, by R. S. CONWAY. Cambridge, At the University Press. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897. Two volumes. Pp. xxvi + 686. Price, \$7.50.

This work, which bears witness to long and careful preparation, is the first attempt to present in English the remains of the Italic dialects, including a grammar, glossary, and brief treatment of the syntax. The only work which can be compared with it in any language is von Planta's *Grammatik der oskisch-umbrischen Dialekte*, the second volume of which, including the inscriptions,

glosses and a glossary, appeared shortly before Conway's work. Von Planta treats the phonetics and forms with greater fullness. In many other respects Conway is fuller and more satisfactory. Students of the Italic dialects may deem themselves fortunate in having both works, and both are indispensable. Conway does not include the inscriptions of the Veneti, nor the Messapian and Etruscan inscriptions. The reason for their omission is obvious. Not only are the remains of dialects given, but some account of the history of the tribes who spoke them, and the book is thus made extremely valuable and usable for those whose chief interest is in Latin.

The claim is well made that the language and institutions of Rome itself cannot be fully understood if isolated from the kindred speech and customs of neighboring peoples. The development of phonetic research within the past twenty years has made it possible to speak with much greater certainty of the genesis of many forms, and the chief block to the complete understanding of the dialects lies in the paucity of the inscriptions themselves. The number of Oscan inscriptions is constantly increasing. This is not true of the Umbrian, but the length and good preservation of the Iguvine tables afford a partial compensation. In addition to the inscriptions, Conway calls in the testimony of coins, of ancient writers, and glosses, and the indirect evidence afforded by geographical and personal names found in the several dialect-areas. In the case of the Aurunci, §283, we have only the evidence of proper names. Great pains have been taken also to verify by actual inspection the reading of the inscriptions, or, where this was not possible, to secure impressions of the same. In this way the reading of several inscriptions previously edited has been corrected. Some of the corrections were independently made by Mr. Walter Dennison, Fellow of the American School of Classical Studies in Rome, to whom credit is given in the Addenda. Some of the corrections were also independently made by von Planta, so that this united testimony begets great confidence. It would be hard, indeed, to overpraise the accuracy characterizing the whole work, and the painstaking effort visible throughout to eliminate errors. It is superfluous to remark that the writer is perfectly familiar with all the literature bearing upon his subject.

That even lists of proper names may throw some light upon the period of Italian history preceding continuous tradition is well illustrated by the author, who shows that in central Italy the names in *-no*, like *Sabini*, *Latini*, *Frentani*, etc., seem to belong to a later stratum of population than those ending in *-co*, as *Osci*, *Volsci*, *Aurunci*, etc., the order of the suffixes, indeed, in such names as *Sidicini*, *Marrucini* being in itself significant. The arrangement of the material follows the geographical order, beginning at the south. This greatly facilitates tracing the influence of one dialect upon its neighbors. Two new groups

have been marked off—namely, North Oscan (i. e. Paeligni, Marrucini, Vestini, with the valley of the Aternus) and Latinian (a rather unfortunate name), including the tribes on the borders of Latium and in constant intercourse with the Latin from the earliest times (i. e. the Marsi, Aequi, Hernici, Sabini, Falisci and Praeneste).

Great care has been taken with the typography. Facsimiles are not given, but the general character of the alphabet used in each inscription is always noted, as well as letters of peculiar form, the presence or lack of interpuncts, and other things helpful for interpretation.

It would be impossible in the space at our disposal, to enumerate the excellencies of the work or to point out the several contributions which it makes to our knowledge. A few things only may be noted. Bantia is included in Apulia by Conway, who sides with Kirchhoff in making the relation between the Latin and the Oscan side of the Tabula Bantina purely accidental. He regards the Latin as the earlier of the two, although the difference in time is not great. Some probable restorations are offered and a discriminating use made of the previous studies of Kirchhoff, Buecheler and Bréal.

The curious forms in the inscription of Luceria (given also by Lindsay in his Latin Inscriptions, p. 56)—*fundatid*, *proiectatid* and *parentatid*—are admitted to be possibly Oscan, although the rest of the inscription is in Latin, though *stircus* may be also dialectal; cf. Lindsay.

In the glosses great use of Hesychius has been made, and it is a suggestive inference of Conway that the words of Italic origin which found their way into Greek, through Epicharmus, Sophron and Rhinthon, were probably drawn from the Oscan, this being the only Italian dialect with which the Greeks of Sicily would come frequently into contact.

The Oscan inscriptions of Pompeii, including the alphabets there found, receive careful treatment, and their dates are approximately settled. *Vaamunim* against Nissen is made to equal *vadimonium*, but in a local sense, i. e. the part of the forum where bail was answered to. Von Planta gives no decisive opinion on this word.

One is struck with the small number of inscriptions from Herculaneum. Further excavations would doubtless add many.

The cippus Abellanus, one of the most important monuments, is dated not earlier than 150 B. C. The heraldic dedications (*iuvilas*), most of which have been discovered within the past few years, are treated with greater fullness than ever before. Their sepulchral character, for the most part, seems clearly proved, although the epithet Flavius applied to Jupiter is still doubtful in this connection. One may compare *Zeús φλεγόμενος πυρί* (Aristoph. Lys. 1285); cf. Phlegethon.

On p. 226 the suggestion is made that *grunnire* = *grundire* may be Oscan. But if one will not admit the possibility of *nd*

becoming *nn* in Latin, phonetically, may not the principle of adaptation have had some influence here, making *grunnire* (the usual form, by the way, in the Voces animantium) conform to *hinnire*, *tinnire*, *gannire*, *fritinnire*, *grinnire*, and other similar words? cf. Loewe, Rhein. Mus. 34, p. 494. The principle of the invariability of phonetic law is sometimes urged too far, as, e. g., in the unwillingness (p. 223) to fully equate *meridie* with *medidie*.

In the note on *triumphus*, p. 230, Conway has neglected to note that the "supposed derivation" from *τρι* and *ὀμφή* has actually been espoused by Stowasser, Dunkle Wörter, p. 12, and Sonny, Arch. f. lat. Lex. VIII, p. 132.

In passing I may note that the archaic inscriptions to Hercules from Praeneste 285 and 286, whose present location is not noted, are to be found in Rome in the Museo delle Terme (Chiostro Ala II, Casetta E).

The second volume gives an account of the alphabets, an outline, concise but clear, of the grammar of the dialects, a brief sketch of the syntax, an appendix with alien, spurious or doubtful inscriptions, indices of proper names, geographical and personal, a glossary of the dialects, and an index of Latin words. The latter is not quite as full as we could have wished. The glossary seems reasonably complete, although in the case of doubtful words (e. g. *ὑψun*) it does not always give explanations proposed elsewhere by Conway himself and others. Under *Maesio—Pappus Maesius*, the reference to 255, p. 273, is omitted. Cicirrus (cf. Dietrich, Pulcinella, p. 95) is not included.

The usefulness of the work would have been greatly increased, it seems to us, if a Latin or English translation had been added of the inscriptions whose interpretation is reasonably certain.

In the list of books, p. xx, we find Kaibel's *Inscriptiones Graecae, Italiae et Sardiniae* (the correct title, with *Siciliae* for *Sardiniae*, is given p. xxv).

We cannot take leave of the work without expressing the wish that it may find a place in the library of many Latin scholars, and so extend and increase the interest in the study of the dialects.

MINTON WARREN.

Selected Letters of Cicero. Edited, with Introduction and Notes, by FRANK FROST ABBOTT, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago. Boston, U. S. A., and London, Ginn & Co., 1897.

Prof. Abbott has performed with tact and judgment the task of selection, as to the difficulty of which he speaks feelingly in his preface; the letters of Cicero himself given in this edition well illustrate both the varied interests of the writer and the variations in his epistolary style, and of those from his correspondents all